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In 1928 Sylvain Lévi obtained in Kathmandu a copy of an incomplete manuscript of Sthiramati’s Madhyântavibhâgaṭīkā, a commentary on Vasubandhu’s Madhyântavibhâgabhâṣya which explains the kârikās written by Maitreyya. Sylvain Lévi entrusted the edition of the text to Yamaguchi Susumâ who first edited the Sanskrit text of the first two chapters in several issues of the Ōtani Gakuho in the years 1930–1932. In 1934 Yamaguchi published an edition of the complete text in which the missing parts were restored with the help of the Tibetan translation. In 1930 Tucci announced an edition with a complete restoration into Sanskrit from the Tibetan of all missing passages, by himself and Vidhûsekha Bhaṭṭācârya. The first and only chapter of this edition appeared in 1932. Yamaguchi published a complete Japanese translation of the Madhyântavibhâgaṭīkā in 1935. The first chapter was rendered into English simultaneously by Th. Stcherbatsky and D. L. Friedmann.

6 Th. Stcherbatsky, Madhyântavibhâga. Discourse on Discrimination between Middle and Extremes ascribed to Maitreyya and commented by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati. Moscow–Leningrad, 1936 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, XXX). Cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, V (1937),
In 1937 Yamaguchi published a synoptic edition of the Tibetan translation and the two Chinese translations by Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang of Vasubandhu's bhāṣya. A translation of the third chapter of the bhāṣya was published by Paul Wilfred O'Brien S. J. in 1953–1954. In 1934 Rahula Saksrityāyana discovered a manuscript of the bhāṣya in the Nor Monastery in Tibet. The text was published by Gadjin M. Nagao in 1964. Nagao also translated chapters 1 and 3 of the bhāṣya and a complete translation is due to appear in vol. 15 of the Dajō butten. Another edition of the bhāṣya appeared in 1967. Vasubandhu's bhāṣya contains the complete text of the kārikā-s. Parts of both the kārikā-s and the bhāṣya are quoted in Sthiramatī's tīkā. The publication of the text of the kārikā-s and the bhāṣya makes it possible to correct the text of the quotations in the tīkā. This is of course especially important for the quotations which have been restored from the Tibetan by the editors of the tīkā.

The restoration of a Sanskrit text from the Tibetan is a difficult undertaking. I believe that in the case of a philosophical text such as the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā, which has been carefully translated into Tibetan, it is justified to attempt to reconstruct at least the technical terms. With the help of parallel passages it is also sometimes possible to restore the original Sanskrit text. However, it is certainly impossible to reconstruct the original text in its entirety. La Vallée Poussin, quoting Tucci's words: "by the combined efforts of myself and of Vidhuśekhara Śāstri, it is hoped to be restored completely in its Sanskrit original form", comments as follows: "Magnanime pensée! Car il est rare qu'on puisse restituer avec confiance ne fût-ce qu'une strophe estropiée ou lacuneuse." How different the results of attempted restorations can be is clearly

shown by the two editions of the first chapter and Stecherbatsky's translation of the same chapter in which many passages have been restored in the notes. Until recently the only text available for chapters 2 to 5 of Sthiramatī's tīkā was that published by Yamaguchi in 1934. Yamaguchi's restorations are based upon a careful study of the Sanskrit text of the tīkā and the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the kārikā-s, the bhāṣya and the tīkā. However, Yamaguchi's restorations are not always acceptable and, in several cases, the restored text is written in undiomatic or even incorrect Sanskrit. In 1971 Ramchandra Pandeya published the Sanskrit text of the kārikā-s, the bhāṣya and the tīkā. According to the preface his edition corrects the text of the missing parts of the tīkā with the help of the Tibetan version and the text of the bhāṣya. Pandeya has noted the readings of the bhāṣya, but his claim to have made use of the Tibetan translation of the tīkā is not borne out by an examination of several passages of the second chapter. He seems to have done nothing more than to correct Yamaguchi's restorations according to his own light without any recourse to the Tibetan version.

In the following notes all references are to page and line of Yamaguchi's edition. P = the Peking edition of the Tibetan translation of the tīkā in volume 109 of the Japanese reprint. R.P. = Ramchandra Pandeya's edition. Sanskrit words which have been restored by Yamaguchi are printed in italics.

P. 67.28–68.1: yaś-na ji-ltar Dkon-mehog-brtsegs-pa chen-pol-as / de'i bsam-pa mya-nan-las 'das-pa yaś gnas-la / 'khor-ba-na yaś sbyor-bar gnas-pa zes bstan-pa lta-bu ste. Yamaguchi's restoration: atha vā yathoktaṃ Mahāratnakūṭe / tasyāśayaś nirvāṇe ca tiṣṭhati saṃsāre caprayogena tiṣṭhati (p. 267.4–6). In his translation Yamaguchi refers to von Staël-Holstein's preface to his edition of the Kāśyapaparivarta (Shanghai, 1926), p. XV: "The assumption that Sthiramatī himself regarded Ratnakūta as the title of the work he had commented upon seems also to be supported by the concluding verse of the commentary." Yamaguchi adds that he has not been able to trace the quotation in the Chinese translations of the Kāśyapaparivarta. However, it is to be found in section 16 of the Sanskrit text: nirvāṇagataś cāsyāśayaḥ saṃsāragataś ca prayo-

gañ. The Tibetan translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta has: de'i bsam-pa mya-ñan-las 'das-pa la yañ gnas-la sbyor-ba 'khor-ba-na yañ gnas-pa. R. P.: sa āśayena nirvāṇe tiṣṭhati, samsāre ca prayogeṇa tiṣṭhatīti.


P. 79.16: kujano hi pratipattiyuktam api bodhisattvopamitam na jānīte. P.: skye-bo ņan-pa ni sgrub-pa dañ-ldan-pa'i byañ-chub sms-dpa' la 'di'o āes mi āes-pa'o. Read: kujano hi pratipattiyuktam api bodhisattvo 'yam iti na jānīte. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.


P. 91.22: aparīpūrṇena echandavīryacittamimāṁsānām anyatama-vaikalyād [vikala]bhāvanayā ca prahānasamkāramvaikalyād iti. P.:
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'dun-pa daṇḍ brtson-'grus daṇḍ sems daṇḍ / dpyod-pa rnams las gaṅ-yaṅ ruṅ-ba žig ma-tshaṅ-ba yoṅs-su rdzogs-pa daṇ / spoṅ-ba'i 'du-byed bsgom-pa ma-tshaṅ-bas žes-bya-ba. This passage is a quotation from the bhâṣya, cf. Nagao's edition p. 33.10: paripûrṇa ca cchandavîryacittamîmâṁsânân anyatamavaiâkalyât / bhâvanâyâ ca prahânasasâmskâravaîkalyât. The Tibetan translation of the bhâṣya has: 'dun-pa daṇḍ / brtson-'grus daṇḍ sems daṇḍ / dpyod-rnams las gaṅ-yaṅ ruṅ-ba žig ma-tshaṅ-bas yoṅs-su rdzogs-pa daṇ / spoṅ-ba'i 'du-byed bsgom-pa ma-tshaṅ-bas (Yamaguchi's edition, p. 35.7). Sthiramati's tîkâ explains that samâdhi can have two deficiencies (p. 91.21: samâdher dvayâhînâtâ āvâramân uktam): 1. Lack of completeness because of the absence of chanda, virya, citta or mîmâṃsâ (p. 92.1: tatra paripûrîhînâtâ tāsām chandavîryacitta- mîmâṁsânân anyatamavaiâkalyât). 2. Absence of bhâvanâ because of the absence of one of the eight prahânasasâmskâra (p. 92.2: bhâvanâ hiyata ity aśtprahânasasâmskârânâm anyatamavaiâkalyât). R. P. reads apripûrṇa instead of paripûrṇa. The edition of the Madhyânta-vibhâgabhâṣya by Nathmal Tatiya and Anantalal Thakur has aprîpi- pûrṇa. The instrumetalas paripûrṇa and bhâvanâyâ depend on the preceding word in the bhâṣya: dvayâhînâtâ. In his edition Nagao adds a daṇḍa between-hînâtâ and paripûrṇa. This daṇḍa is not to be found in the manuscript and has to be omitted.14


P. 96.22: yathâbhûtaśrûlârthavicâraṇâ. P.: thos-pa'i don-la sgra

---

14 In an article in 'Japanese, 'Some Problems in the Madhyântavibhâgabhâṣya', Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, XXII (1974), pp. 402–406, which came to my notice after having written these notes, Funahashi Naoya discusses this passage. I am glad to see that he has arrived at the same solution. Funahashi has also written two articles on the bhâṣya in Japanese: 'Some Problems in the Madhyântavibhâgabhâṣya' – with special reference to the three chapters: laksâṇa-pariccheda, âvaraṇa-pariccheda and tattvapa- riccheda', Ōtani Gakuhô, LI, 3 (1973), pp. 50–66; 'Japanese translation and study of the Madhyântavibhâgabhâṣya (âvaraṇa-pariccheda)', Bukkyô-gaku Seminâ, vols. 18–19. I have not yet been able to see the second article.
ji-bzin-du spyod-pa. Yamaguchi indicates that yathābhūtaśrutārtha is quoted from the bhāṣya, cf. Nagao’s edition p. 34.17: ayathārutaśrutārthāvabodhā. Read: yathārutaśrutārthāvicāraṇā. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.


P. 102.11: śrutārthaṁ sarvakleśasahanādibhir apy abhedāyāt. P.: thos-pa’i ched-du ŋon-moṅs-pa thams-cad la yaṁ mi ’byid-pa’i phyir-ro. Yamaguchi adds in a note that sahana is not rendered into Tibetan. His restoration is clearly based upon a misreading; mi-’byed-pa’i instead of mi-’byid-pa’i. The Tibetan translation has translated sarvakleśasahanāt rather freely: “because he does not slip in all impurities”. Read: sarvakleśasahanād iti. R. P.: sarvakleśasahanādibhir apy abhedāvatvāt.


It would certainly be possible to propose a different text for other passages restored by Yamaguchi, but there is not much to be gained by correcting Yamaguchi’s restorations unless they can be shown to be wrong or improved by making use of parallel passages. From the examples given above it is obvious that Ramchandra Pandeya has not made any contribution towards the establishment of a more correct Sanskrit text on the basis of the Tibetan translation. In his introduction he accuses Yamaguchi of having failed to read the MS. correctly and of possessing insufficient familiarity with the complicated grammar of Sanskrit. Elsewhere in his preface he states that “many scholars, like Yamaguchi, have committed serious mistakes because of their preference for Tibetan or Chinese versions over original Sanskrit”. Pandeya adds that “when the original Sanskrit is available, not much reliance should be placed on Tibetan

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18} Pandeya does not seem to have had access to the manuscript used by Yamaguchi. For a well-founded opinion of Pandeya’s carefulness in reading manuscripts see Wezler’s remarks in his article: ‘Some Observations on the Yuktidipikā’, Supplement II. XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge herausgegeben von Wolfgang Voigt. Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 434–455.}\]
or Chinese translations"; but he seems to be unaware of the fact that a single manuscript (in this case a recent copy of a manuscript) does not represent the original Sanskrit text and that its value can only be judged with the help of Tibetan and Chinese translations. If Pandeya had carefully studied the Tibetan translation of Sthiramati's तिकु, his edition would have been welcome. In the study of Buddhist Sanskrit texts the Tibetan translations cannot be neglected without harmful consequences.